



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

empfindend in meinen Homer hineingelesen habe'. And that is really what he has done: he has presented in this book what he has read into his Homer.

WM. K. PRENTICE.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

The *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, edited with Introduction and Commentary by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. London, and New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

This is an edition of the *Argonautica* with an English commentary interpreting the text of the poem and dealing with the subject matter. It is a well-printed volume of more than four hundred pages. The Introduction deals in successive chapters with the life of Apollonius, with the sources of the poem, with the poem itself, the manuscripts, scholia, editions, and translations. The text with critical notes and commentary on the same page is the heart of the book. Discussions of the double recension of the *Argonautica* and of the metre are given in the Appendices. An index of proper names and an index of words discussed in the notes complete the volume.

The text is a primary matter for an editor. Mr. Mooney does not constitute his text, but accepts Mr. Seaton's Oxford edition of 1900, making certain modifications and introducing sparingly his own conjectures. His critical notes are fuller than Mr. Seaton's, but the additions are, so far as I have observed, from Brunck and Merkel and contain no fresh material. Upon his own initiative Mr. Mooney has in a few cases modified the text of 1900 in the same way in which Mr. Seaton has, in his recent Loeb Library edition. Many readings, however, including a few typographical errors, have been accepted which Mr. Seaton has now changed for the better.

In the commentary the editor addresses himself to the interpretation of language and subject matter. He has many notes on the vocabulary, he discusses obscure expressions, offers comments on questions of syntax, draws upon the scholia for illustrative purposes, and brings many parallels from the poets earlier and later. Not infrequently he has corrected misconceptions that have found lodgment in Liddell and Scott and have borne fruit in current translations; e. g., in the meaning of *ἐμοιρήσαντο*, 4. 1533. Much material has been brought together in the commentary and in the other parts of the book that was before widely scattered. But it must be said that the material has not been organized into a critical edition; and much that is fresh and valuable has been overlooked, or if used not thoroughly used.

The lexical element is prominent in the notes. Words used only by Apollonius, or words first used by him, or words that emerge in the Alexandrian period are frequently cited. This information seems to come for the most part from Liddell and Scott. I would not mention a mistake like that concerning *λέχρις*, 1. 1235 (cf. Antimachus of Colophon, frag. 35), were it not for the impression that one frequently gets that these positive statements are nothing more than *ex silentio* conclusions from Liddell and Scott. But that would be a minor matter if Mr. Mooney had made his lexical observations yield something for textual criticism or interpretation. Rzach, for example, scrutinized the diction of Apollonius for the sake of determining the poet's attitude toward older epic usage and of detecting the presence of extraneous influences, such as that of tragedy or of prose or of the Hellenistic idiom. Mr. Mooney admits into his text Attic forms that Rzach justly condemns (A. J. Ph. 22. 330). The note to 2. 1005, *γατομέοντες*, "a verb first used by Alexandrian writers", misses the point: the existence of a Doric $\bar{\alpha}$ in an epic poem. Although in a note to p. 25 the editor refers to Boesch, he misses the point of Boesch's observation that this anomalous word with its Doric coloring came into the late epic from tragedy by way of Lycophron. The influence of tragedy is recognized for *όθούνεκεν*, 3. 933; it might have been recognized for *ἐκητι*, 4. 1087, the only certain case in Apollonius of this meaning, *quantum attinet ad*. In 1. 851, *χάριν* may be held to have Homeric precedent; but hardly *ἐμὴν χάριν*, 2. 632, which has frequent parallels in tragedy. So, too, with *ὄπως*, 1. 285, which stands in a context where *ὄφρα* and a past tense of the indicative in a final clause are found, a piece of Attic syntax that has established itself in Alexandrian poetry (Theocr. 4. 49; 7. 87; 11. 55) although not with the epic *ὄφρα* which Apollonius uses. In the *Argonautica* we always find *Ἰκέσιος*, not the Homeric *Ἰκετήσιος*. The former is a familiar word in tragedy, and the initial vowel is regularly short. Rzach using the long \bar{i} of the initial vowel in Apollonius as a basis infers as a source some unknown epic poet whom Apollonius followed. It may be said against this view that the lengthening of the vowel is due to metrical pressure since it is frequently found in hexameter verse (Anth. P. XI. 351, 8; Tryph. 278; Nonnus Dionys. 18. 18). Whatever be the conclusion it is the attitude toward the facts that is important; out of the facts comes a conclusion bearing upon the poet's choice of words, or if not a conclusion, at least a state of mental alertness that will in the end prove fruitful. Greater care should have been taken in elaborating the correct observation to 1. 713 that *ὄρωρε* = *ἐστί*. Of the four other cases cited the relevancy of 1. 1291 is refuted by the editor's note to the passage; 2. 473 is not in point; 3. 457 should be 3. 487. One correct example is left, 2. 312.

Considerable attention is given in the commentary to syntax, but problems are often not sharply formulated. In 1. 197 occurs an aorist infinitive after *δίω* which all editors interpret as representing an original indicative with *ἄν*. One of the older editors wished to emend the text, by inserting *ἄν*. The question at issue, the omission of the particle with this type of apodosis, is not distinctly raised and statistics are offered that bear upon two other questions. There is a lack of delimitation in the note to 1. 660, where again the text has been impugned. The note is very much as if paragraphs 321 and 322 of Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses* were blended in one. Brunck's proposal to read a future for an aorist infinitive in 1. 1343 has strong reasons behind it if one observes the use of tenses after *ἐλπομαι* in Apollonius. The many indirect reports of thoughts, expressions, and threats that occur in the *Argonautica* contain phenomena worthy of remark, and many problems worthy of an editor's attention. The optative in 3. 99 is not explained, except for a note to 1. 480, where it receives incidental mention as a potential. Is it not rather an imperative optative (Gildersleeve, *Syntax of Cl. Greek*, 394, 430)? He does not even pause at the tense of *μολεῖν*, 2. 1223. It cannot be said, however, that all difficult cases are ignored; the unusual use of *εἰ*, 1. 291, is called "irregular", and a Homeric parallel is cited. Along with 1. 291 should go 1. 1285. The two are not identical, yet in both cases it seems easier to explain the use of *εἰ* as due to the later construction with *θαυμάζω* and similar verbs. Another passage is 3. 816, where Homer's *εἰ ἔτερόν γε*, "so surely as" is explained as a true protasis; not however convincingly. Apollonius seems to press the phrase to the point of meaning "in proportion as".

In the introduction is a chapter on the sources. This is the most difficult part of an editor's task; it is a field where much preliminary work remains to be done. It is true that the material which an editor needs to use is widely scattered, yet not so widely as to require extraordinary diligence. It must be premised that a full discussion of the sources would be impossible within the limits of any ordinary edition. What then has an editor to do with the sources? This, at least, to illustrate a given passage of the text and to throw light on the poet's way of shaping his narrative. One does not need to know at first all the literature of the subject, but one must have formed the habit of looking at the text and the scholia analytically. Apollonius constantly blends his sources. He blends to some extent in the matter of vocabulary, using new with the old; so, too, with his syntax; but still more does he blend old and new, obvious and remote, in his mythology, his geography, and his local history. This is the most salient feature of his method.

In this sense Mr. Mooney has hardly begun to work with the sources. He does not deal sharply with the text nor does he show real familiarity with the scholia. To illustrate the latter:

an apparently simple note from the scholia is incorporated in the commentary to 1. 943. But the obvious interpretation which the reader would give to the scholium, viz., that Apollonius is here following Herodorus is made difficult if not impossible by another scholium, not here quoted, to 1. 1289. Here then is an explanation that itself needs explaining. Furthermore, the introductory chapter shows no appreciation of recent work in this field. The statement is made on p. 21: "the story of Aristaeus and the Etesian winds is derived from Pindar Pythian IX". While this statement is not without its foundation it is quite inadequate, for Pindar does not mention the Etesian winds, and Aristaeus is a secondary not a primary figure in the Pythian ode. Besides, the article "Aristaios" in Pauly-Wissowa's *Encyclopedia* to which the reader is referred in the commentary to 2. 506 calls attention to the various strands, foreign to Pindar, that are twisted into the narrative of Apollonius. The same article mentions Studniczka's conclusion drawn from the combined evidence in Pindar and Apollonius that the figure of Aristaeus appeared even earlier, in the Hesiodic *Eoëe* that lies back of Pindar. Even if one is not familiar with Studniczka's *Kyrene*—and the later work by Malten, *Kyrene*, Berlin, 1911,—the composite, aetiological character of the passage of Apollonius may be inferred from a scrutiny of the text of the poem. I mention in this connection a few studies of the sources which have value for their results as well as for the method. In the last edition of Rohde's *Psyche*, or in any edition for that matter, one will find properly indexed under *Aethalides* a clean-cut discussion which furnishes just the background for 1. 640-649, where Apollonius imports purposeless information into his story and then apologizes for it. Here, too, is found a good example of what must be done to make the scholia of real value. In *Hermes* 35. 75 f., it is shown by Reitzenstein that 4. 790-809 is based upon the *Cypria*; this affords an illustration of the relation of Apollonius to the earlier epic about which there are brief and vague references in the Introduction. One of the freshest and most suggestive lines of recent investigation is conveniently summed up in Roscher's *Mythologisches Lexikon*, s. v. *Seirenen*. The place of Apollonius in the history of ancient belief about the Sirens, the convergence of the two streams of Homeric and popular tradition, and the significance of the passing reference to the metamorphosis, 4. 896-899, are briefly but convincingly set forth. Let me not be understood as animadverting on the editor's failure to find this or that important article; anyone might fail in that way. But Mr. Mooney does not seem to be looking for such help. His attitude toward the whole mythological tradition which is so richly represented in the text and scholia of his author is less discriminating than one has a right to expect. He shows no quick feeling for the difference between primary and secondary sources, between first-hand and second-hand infor-

mation. The note to 4. 1427 concerning the names of the Hesperides is in point. One tradition, we are vaguely told, includes Hestia among them. Now the only authority for Hestia as one of the Hesperides is the text of Apollodori Bibliotheca, II 114 (Wagner), where *Ἑσπερία* stands by emendation in recent editions. The names of the Hesperides are perhaps not of vital importance, yet one who seeks would surely find something of value to say about them. One observation is certainly a mistake: 3. 276 is called an imitation of Anacreon 3. 27; that is, "Anacreon" is quoted from an edition that does not discern between Anacreon and the Anacreontea. On other than literary grounds the genuineness of this poem (Bergk 31), can be disputed. I once entered in my Apollonius this quotation from one of Miss Harrison's popular essays, which is, to be sure, nothing more than the light of common day but suffices as a side-light for our passage: "Eros is a stranger to black-figured art; in red-figured vases he is a slender youth; only in the Alexandrian and Roman periods a baby boy". In connection with Eros one is reminded of Helbig's *Untersuchungen über die Campanische Wandmalerei*, a book whose importance for the higher interpretation of Apollonius has not suffered by the passage of forty years. Finally, the note to 4. 478 which concerns a special form of the saliva charm should be corrected by a reference to Aeschylus frag. 354; cf. Rohde's *Psyche* I. 326, where there is an elaborate discussion of *μασχαλισμός*.

In conclusion let me say that this review is written in full consciousness of the special difficulties that beset an editor of Apollonius, and in the belief that cooperation on the part of all who concern themselves with the *Argonautica* is most desirable. Perhaps one should be content if the editor has in this case accomplished what he proposed to himself, to occupy the field and to bring together the most accessible material. Nevertheless one may well regret that when so sumptuous a volume was planned, a more exacting standard was not set.

EDWARD FITCH.

HAMILTON COLLEGE.

La Vie de Saint Remi, Poème du XIII^e siècle, Par Richier, Publié pour la première fois d'après deux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles, par W. N. BOLDERSTON. London: Henry Frowde, 1912. Pp. 356. 8vo.

In 877-8 that famous ecclesiastical ruffian, Hincmar, wrote a political pamphlet under the guise of a biography of St. Remi, his predecessor in the diocese of Reims. To enhance his own